## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA RICHMOND DIVISION

| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ex rel. | ) |                           |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| ROGER CHARLES DAY, JR.            | ) |                           |
|                                   | ) | Civil No. 3:23-cv-371-REP |
| Plaintiff,                        | ) |                           |
|                                   | ) |                           |
| v.                                | ) |                           |
|                                   | ) |                           |
| BOEING, et al.,                   | ) |                           |
|                                   | ) |                           |
| Defendants.                       | ) |                           |

## UNITED STATES' RESONSE TO RELATOR'S RENEWED MOTION TO VACATE ORDER OF DISMISSAL

After intervening in the action, and upon the motion of the United States, by Order entered November 30, 2023, the Court dismissed the complaint. Dkt. 14.

Following the entry of the dismissal Order, Relator moved to vacate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) as Relator had not filed a response to the government's motion. Importantly, Relator advanced arguments on both excusable neglect *and* arguments regarding dismissal under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3730(c)(2)(A), the provision governing dismissals of *qui tam* actions.

Relator's reconsideration motion was denied by the Court "because the Relater has not, in the moving papers or briefs, shown a meritorious defense. A meritorious defense is a threshold necessity for relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) and a motion seeking relief under that rule 'requires a proffer of evidence which would permit a finding for the defaulting party.' *Augusta Fiberglass Coatings, Inc. v. Fodor Contracting Corp.*, 843 F.2d 808, 812 (4th Cir. 1988)." Dkt.

No. 20. The Court said that any renewed motion for reconsideration would need to be filed by February 21, 2024.

On February 21, 2024, the Relator filed a Renewed Motion to Vacate. (Dkt No. 21).

The Renewed Motion does not contain any information, evidence or argument that was not contained in Relator's original motion for reconsideration. (Dkt No. 16). Relator's renewed motion simply restates the arguments contained in his original motion for reconsideration Dkt Nos. 17 & 19. In short, there is no new information, and the Relator has failed to make a showing required by the Court's January 23, 2024, Order.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Renewed Motion for reconsideration should be denied.

Dated: March 1, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,

JESSICA D. ABER United States Attorney

BY: /s/
ROBERT P. MCINTOSH
VSB No. 66113
United States Attorney's Office
919 East Main Street, Suite 1900
Richmond, Virginia 23219
Telephone: (804) 819-7404
Facsimile: (804) 771-2316

Email: Robert.McIntosh@usdoj.gov *Attorneys for the United States* 

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 1st day of March 2024, I will electronically file the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will then send a notification of such filing (NEF) to the following:

Elliott M. Harding, Esquire Harding Counsel, PLLC 1260 Clifden Greene Charlottesville, Virginia 22901 Email: elliott@hardingcounsel.com

And I hereby certify that I will mail the document by United States mail, first-class postage prepaid, to the non-filing user addressed as follows:

/s/ Robert P. McIntosh Virginia Bar Number 66113 Attorney for the United States of America United States Attorney's Office 919 East Main Street, Suite 1900 Richmond, Virginia 23219 Telephone: (804) 819-7404

Facsimile: (804) 771-2316

Email: Robert.McIntosh@usdoj.gov